

**REMARKS:**

Claims 1-62 and 64-71 are currently pending.

Claim 1 has been amended to add the recitation of dependent claim 16. Accordingly, claim 16 has been cancelled.

***Objections***

Claims 68-71 are objected to for informalities. In response, the term “blend” has been deleted from these claims and replaced with the term “olefin polymer.” Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

***Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)***

Claims 1, 4, 21, 22, 26-28, 32, 33, 35-40, 42, and 44-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,143,825 to Beren et al. (“Beren”). Applicants traverse these rejections.

Beren is cited for teaching a multi-component adhesive composition wherein one component is functionalized and another separate component is grafted with maleic anhydride. For example, independent claim 1 recites a functionalized adhesive composition comprising an olefin polymer comprising at least 50% of one or more C3 to C40 olefins having branching prior to functionalization. Accordingly, at least 50% of the adhesive composition as claimed in the present invention will have both branching and functionalization as a result of grafting.

But, while Beren does teach that a branched component is present, Beren does not teach that the branched component is also functionalized. Rather, Beren teaches a multicomponent composition comprising, among other things, a branched component (i.e. “the high strength polypropylene”) having branching and a grafted component (i.e. “the graft based polymer”) being functionalized, but nowhere does Beren teach that the two components have both branching and functionalization. Moreover, Beren teaches the branched component at 10 to 30% by weight of the Beren composition and teaches the graft based polymer at 3 to 30% by weight of the Beren composition, both of which are much less than the 50 mol % of the branched functionalized olefin polymer claimed in the present application.

U. S. Application No. 10/825,349  
Attorney Docket No. 2003B043C  
Reply to Office Action of July 10, 2008  
Response dated September 10, 2008

Furthermore, the new recitation of at least 50% amorphous content has been added to Claim 1 which is not subject to the anticipation rejection.

Alternatively, Beren does not teach quantities of the branched component or the grafted component in the quantities recited in new claims 69-71.

Accordingly, there is no teaching of an adhesive composition composed of a functionalized, branched propylene polymer as recited in the pending claims. Withdrawal of these rejections and allowance of claims 1, 4, 21, 22, 26-28, 32, 33, 35-40, 42, and 44-60 are respectfully requested.

***Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

Claims 1-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Beren patent in view of International Publication No. WO 2003/033612 to Wang et al. (“Wang”) or U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0007033 to Karandinos et al. (“Karandinos”). Applicants traverse these rejections.

Neither the Beren patent, the Wang Publication, nor the Karandinos Publication, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest adhesive compositions composed of the functionalized, branched olefin polymer as recited in the pending claims. As described above, the Beren patent does not teach or suggest adhesive compositions composed of functionalized, branched olefin polymers as claimed in the present application. Neither Wang nor Karandinos cure these deficiencies.

Although Wang describes blends of syndiotactic polypropylene and amorphous polypropylene, there is no teaching or suggestion of functionalized, branched propylene polymers.

Similarly, Karandinos does not teach or suggest functionalizing olefin polymers. The Patent Office’s previously submitted Notice of Allowance mailed September 27, 2007 admits “the polymers disclosed in the prior art of KARANDINOS are not functionalized.” See Reasons for Allowance, p.4.

One skilled in the art would not be motivated to achieve adhesive formulations recited in the pending claims based on the teaching or suggestion of the Beren patent, the Wang Publication, nor the Karandinos Publication because the formulations taught by these references

U. S. Application No. 10/825,349  
Attorney Docket No. 2003B043C  
Reply to Office Action of July 10, 2008  
Response dated September 10, 2008

are, perforce, different from those recited by Applicants. Therefore, it would not be obvious to one skilled in the art to achieve the recited adhesive compositions composed of functionalized, branched propylene polymers.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

### **Conclusion**

Applicants believe that the foregoing is a full and complete response to the Office Action of record. Accordingly, an early and favorable reconsideration of the rejection, and allowance of pending claims 1-62 and 64-71 are requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge counsel's Deposit Account No. 05-1712, for any fees, including extension of time fees and excess claim fees, required to make this response timely and acceptable to the Office.

Respectfully submitted,

September 10, 2008  
Date

/Anthony G. Boone/  
Anthony G. Boone  
Registration No. 57,287  
Attorney for Applicants

ExxonMobil Chemical Company  
Law Technology Department  
P.O. Box 2149  
Baytown, Texas 77522-2149  
Telephone No. 281-834-2866  
Facsimile No. 281-834-2495